

## **REMARKS**

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's allowance of Claims 20-26, 30-35, 43-49. In order to better the claim the present invention, Applicant is amending independent Claims 20, 30 and 43 in a similar manner to independent Claims 17, 27, 36 and 39. This amendment is not being made in response to a patentability rejection. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment does not affect the prior allowability of these claims, and the claims continue to be allowable.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered and the claims continue to be allowed.

### **Claims 36-49**

Upon preparation of this amendment, Applicant found a potential informality in Claims 36-49 and believes that it is possible that Claims 36-49 could be found to be identical with Claims 17-35. Therefore, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and eliminate any possibility for such an informality, Applicant is amending independent Claims 36, 39 and 43. In particular, Applicant is amending Claims 36 and 39 as discussed below and Claim 43 as discussed above. In addition, Applicant is adding the features of pixels "over the substrate" and a driving circuit "over the substrate". These features are supported by, for example, Fig. 12 of the present application.

This amendment addition is not being made in response to a patentability rejection.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered and allowed.

Applicant will now address each of the Examiner's remaining objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

#### Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claim 41 as being identical to Claim 40. In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is canceling Claim 41 without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this objection moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner rejects Claims 17-19, 27-29 and 36-42 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al. (US 6,501,456) in view of Warner (US 3,821,724). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending independent Claims 17, 27, 36 and 39. In particular, Claims 17, 27, 36 and 39 have been amended to recite the feature of the connection between "first to n-th digital data latch circuits" and "n signal lines", which is supported by, for example, Fig. 1 of the present application. More specifically, Claims 17, 27, 36 and 39 have been amended to recite the feature of "first to n-th digital data latch circuits, each of which is connected to a digital data input terminal, corresponding one of the first to n-th resistor circuits, and corresponding one of n signal lines."

In contrast, this feature is not disclosed or suggested in Saito or Warner. For example, in Warner (see e.g. Fig. 1), n x m (5 x 12) latch circuits 21 are disclosed, and n

(5) of the latch circuits (A-12 to E-12) might be connected to the n (5) of the shift resistor circuit (36). However, each of the output terminals of the n (5) of the latch circuits (A-12 to E-12) is connected to the neighboring one of the latch circuits, and not to “n signal lines,” as in Claims 17, 27, 36 and 39. Therefore, Warner (and Saito) does not disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Hence, even if it proper to combine the latch circuits in Warner with the display device of Saito (which Applicant does not admit is proper), the combination would still not arrive at the display device of Claims 17, 27, 36 and 39. Accordingly, Claims 17, 27, 36 and 39 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: August 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500  
Customer No. 26568